

1  
2  
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
5

6 Michael G. Naessens,  
7 Plaintiff(s),  
8 v.  
9 Bank of America, N.A.,  
10 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:25-cv-01079-RFB-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 66]

11 On June 23, 2025, the Court granted Plaintiff's motion to file electronically. Docket No.  
12 6 at 2. Pending before the Court now is Plaintiff's motion to "enforce" that prior order. Docket  
13 No. 66. The motion accuses the Clerk's Office of failing to correct issues with his CM/ECF  
14 account or to correct clerical errors on the docket. *See id.* at 2. Plaintiff indicates that "[t]hese  
15 problems are purely clerical." *Id.* At bottom, the motion asks for judicial intervention to "direct  
16 the Clerk" to make corrections. *See id.* at 3. The motion identifies no legal authority in support  
17 of that relief and the types of issues identified fall within the province of the Clerk's Office. *See,*  
18 *e.g.*, Local Rule IC 1-1(a), (e), (g). The Court is not persuaded that judicial intervention is  
19 warranted, so Plaintiff's motion is DENIED.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: September 24, 2025

22  
23   
24 Nancy J. Koppe  
25 United States Magistrate Judge  
26  
27  
28